

## **SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

### **M.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**

NOTICE: The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

#### **I. Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR Chapter 1)**

<b>Provision Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Title</b>
52.217-5	Jul 1990	Evaluation of Options

#### **II. NASA FAR Supplement (48 CFR Chapter 18)**

<b>Provision Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Title</b>
-----------------------------	-------------	--------------

None incorporated by reference

(End of Provision)

### **M.2 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS**

As provided for in FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions," the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except for clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

(End of Provision)

### **M. 3 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS**

(a) Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as areas, factors, and sub-factors to be eligible for award. Failure to comply with solicitation requirements may result in an offeror being removed from consideration for award. Any exceptions to solicitation requirements must be fully explained or justified.

(b) Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates.

Late proposals will not be accepted in accordance with FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition".

Instructions for proposal arrangement, page limitations, copies, and due dates are specified in Section L.16.2. Offerors shall submit their proposals in accordance with those instructions. Pages and foldouts not conforming to the definition of a page, pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified, and pages submitted within a volume which clearly do not belong in that volume will not be evaluated by the Government, will not be adjusted by the Government to conform to the RFP requirements, and will be returned to the offeror.

For example, a volume has a requirement for a page limit of 60 pages with Arial font with single-spaced 12-point text and one-inch margins. The following are examples of non-conformances: (1) If an offeror submits this volume with 60 pages, two of which contain tables with 10 point font [if those two pages of tables in 10 point font were not removed as a result of excess pages] the two pages will be returned to the offeror and will not be adjusted or evaluated; (2) If an offeror submits pages for this volume with less than one-inch margins, those pages with the smaller margins will be returned to the offeror and will not be adjusted or evaluated; and (3) If an offeror submits pages for this volume using a different font type than Arial font with single-space 12 point text, then those pages containing the different font type will be returned to the offeror and will not be evaluated. (4) If an offeror submits information in any volume which clearly does not belong in that Volume, the pages containing that information will be returned to the offeror and will not be adjusted or considered for evaluation purposes.

To the extent of any inconsistencies between data provided electronically and proposal hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be the intended data.

(End of Provision)

#### **M.4 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

An initial review of proposals will be conducted to determine acceptability of the proposals in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All unacceptable proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation.

Proposals will be evaluated by the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement. The SEB will carry out the evaluation activities and report its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of mission suitability, past performance, and cost/price evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award.

Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than cost/price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Past Performance is more important than cost/price.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposal using the factors and sub-factors below. Although proposals are organized by factors and sub-factors, the Government will conduct an integrated evaluation to consider consistency among proposal information.

(End of Provision)

### **M.5 VOLUME I – MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR**

The Mission Suitability factor and associated sub-factors are used to assess the ability of the offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the SOW. The Mission Suitability sub-factors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

Technical Approach	500 points
Management Approach	450 points
Safety and Health Approach	50 points
<hr/>	
TOTAL	1000 points

Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based upon the sub-factors set forth below.

#### **M.5.1 TECHNICAL APPROACH (TA)-MISSION SUITABILITY SUB-FACTOR 1**

The offeror's demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements (with supporting rationale) will be evaluated in Technical Approach sub-factor elements as described below.

TA1. Innovations and Efficiencies - The Government will evaluate the offeror's innovations and efficiencies response for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, and feasibility, as well as consistency with the offeror's Management Approach. Failure to capture proposed efficiencies and innovations in Attachment J-12 of the model contract may result in loss of mission suitability points.

TA2. Specific Technical Understanding and Resources - The Government will evaluate the offeror's Specific Technical Understanding and Resources response for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, and feasibility, as well as consistency with the offeror's Management Approach.

#### **M.5.2 MANAGEMENT APPROACH (MA) – MISSION SUITABILITY SUB-FACTOR 2**

The offeror's management approach (with supporting rationale) for fulfilling the contract requirements will be evaluated using the Management Approach sub-factor elements as described below.

MA1. Contract Management Approach –The offeror's Contract Management Approach (MA1) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, and feasibility.

MA2. Staffing Approach –The offeror's Staffing Approach (MA2) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, and feasibility, as well as consistency with the overall Management Approach and rationale.

MA3. Contract Phase-in Approach –The offeror's Contract Phase-in Plan (MA3) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, and feasibility.

MA4. Key Personnel Approach – The offeror's Key Personnel Approach (MA4) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, and feasibility.

#### **M.5.3 SAFETY AND HEALTH APPROACH – MISSION SUITABILITY SUB-FACTOR 3**

The offeror's Safety and Health Approach will be evaluated for overall demonstrated understanding, effectiveness, and completeness.

#### **M.6 VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR**

Past Performance indicates how well an offeror performed on earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well it can be expected to perform the work at hand. The offeror's past performance (contract performance and quality performance), including recent experience, will be evaluated by the Government. The past performance of the proposed Program Manager will also be evaluated.

The Government will use past performance information from proposal data required by provisions of Section L, information obtained by the Government based on communications with listed references, as well as data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources, such as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and similar systems of other governmental departments and agencies, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with client program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources.

Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the offeror and data obtained from other sources. The Government will consider the number and severity of problems, the effectiveness of

corrective actions taken and the overall record of past performance. It shall also consider the offeror's record for adherence to contract schedules, cost control, and the offeror's past performance record on safety, health, and environmental performance.

The past performance evaluation will assess the degree of confidence the government has in the offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements for the contract while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated record of performance in supplying the requirements of this solicitation that meet the user's needs. The offeror's past performance record will be examined for recent and relevant past performance to determine its ability to perform the required work.

Recency: Contracts with more recent performance will be considered to be more relevant than those with more distant performance, assuming all other considerations to be equal. If the contract is still ongoing, it must have a documented performance history. The Government will not consider performance on a newly awarded contract that has no documented performance history (in other words, projects that are less than six months under contract). Only contracts with performance within 5 years from date of the solicitation will be considered recent.

Relevancy: For purposes of this procurement, relevancy will be assessed using the following definitions:

Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved much of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance contractual effort involved some of the magnitude of effort and complexities than this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort did not involve any of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Additionally, for offerors submitting corporate parent, affiliate, or other organization past performance information with their proposal, the Government will consider the degree of contribution (Workforce, Management, Facilities, and Other), the parent, affiliate, or other organization is proposed to provide to the RVGSS effort in determining the applicability of parent, affiliate, or other organization past performance to the RVGSS effort.

Past Performance Confidence Rating. A performance confidence rating will be assessed at the overall factor level for Past Performance after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent and relevant past performance.

Offeror Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings will be assigned as follows:

Very High Level of Confidence

The offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition, indicates exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner and very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist.)

High Level of Confidence

The offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements. Offeror's past performance indicates that contract requirements were accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part, with only minor problems that had little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)

Moderate Level of Confidence

The offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance. Performance was fully responsive to contract requirements; there may have been reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)

Low Level of Confidence

The offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards. Offeror achieved adequate results; there may have been reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)

Very Low Level of Confidence

The offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action was required in one or more areas. Performance problems occurred in one or more areas which, adversely affected overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)

#### Neutral

In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

More recent and more relevant performance will receive greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than less recent and less relevant performance. Relevancy will be based on the size, scope and complexity of the projects being evaluated for past performance. Contracts that exhibit all specific trades/type of work will be considered more relevant than contracts limited to specific trades only.

### **M.7 VOLUME III – COST AND PRICE FACTOR**

**Cost-Reimbursable IDIQ** – The Government will perform a cost realism analysis of the proposed IDIQ direct labor rates and resources, and develop a probable cost estimate for the Sample Task Orders. This evaluation of the cost factors will result in a probable cost which may differ from the proposed cost and reflects the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is most likely to result from the offeror's proposal. The proposed Fully-Burdened Rates (FBRs) for the entire potential period of performance (3 base years and 2 one-year option years) will be evaluated. The Government will also evaluate the reasonableness of the non-labor resources. The FBRs used in developing the cost proposal shall match the FBRs in Section B of the model contract. However, if they do not match, the government will use the FBRs in Section B as a basis for the **proposed** cost.

For evaluation and selection purposes, the Government will use the offeror's proposed contract year one task order labor resources for all contract years including the option years, but will use the applicable FBRs for each contract year for developing the contract fully-burdened labor cost. The price for each task order for the first year shall consist of the following.

- Proposed year one labor resources multiplied by the proposed year one FBRs per SLC,
- Proposed cost of non-labor resources,
- Applied indirect costs to non-labor resources,
- Proposed fee.

**FFP Phase-in** - To promote fair competition, the price of phase-in is not a discriminator for selection purposes, as long as the proposed price of phase-in is reasonable. The Fixed Price proposed for phase-in will only be subject to price analysis. The price of phase-in will be compared to the proposed phase-in prices of other offerors to establish

that the price is reasonable. An unreasonable phase-in price may be addressed in discussions.

**Price and Probable Costs for Selection Purposes** – The results of the Government's cost and price evaluation will be presented to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for consideration in making the source selection. The proposed and probable cost and fee for the three base years and the two options years will be considered for selection purposes.

#### **M.8 VOLUME IV – MODEL CONTRACT**

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements. Offerors will also be evaluated for complete and adequate responses to the requirements of L.16.6, Model Contract (Volume IV). Failure to comply with solicitation requirements and the requirements as detailed in L.16.6, Model Contract (Volume IV), may result in an offeror being removed from consideration for award. Offerors are cautioned that exceptions taken to the solicitation may preclude award to an offeror if award is made without discussions, or may otherwise affect an offeror's competitive standing.

As appropriate, information requested in L.16.6 Model Contract (Volume IV), will be used in determining responsibility in accordance with FAR 9.104-1 General Standards.

#### **M.9 VOLUME V – OTHER PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS**

An offeror must be eligible for award in accordance with FAR 9.104. Subcontractor Arrangement Information, Organizational Conflict of Interest Information, and Business System Adequacy are used to determine eligibility. As appropriate, information requested in L.16.7, Other Proposal Requirements (Volume V), will be used in determining responsibility in accordance with FAR 9.104-1 General Standards.

The items listed below are important Eligibility Considerations; however, these items may not constitute all Eligibility Considerations that will be addressed by the Government pursuant to FAR 9.104.

The Government may choose to evaluate this information for the offerors in the Competitive Range or the apparent Successful Offeror only.

##### **A. Subcontracting Arrangement Information**

The Subcontracting Arrangement Information will be assessed to determine if a formal size determination needs to be made by the Small Business Administration (SBA) and to confirm that the prime contractor making the offer will be performing the primary and vital requirements for the contract. The proposal evaluation may proceed until a final determination is made by the SBA. Offerors are advised that the formal size determination made by SBA may result in the offeror not being eligible for award.

For any joint venture, SBA must approve a joint venture agreement prior to the award of a contract on behalf of the joint venture. Award of the contract will only be made to an approved company or Joint Venture.

##### **B. Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Information**



The Government will perform an analysis to ensure an Organizational Conflict of Interest issue that cannot be mitigated does not exist. The OCI information will be assessed to verify the offeror is eligible for award. If it appears an OCI issue does exist that the offeror's plan failed to mitigate, the Government must notify the contractor, provide the reasons therefore, and allow the contractor a reasonable opportunity to respond. The SEB will make the final determination if the OCI issue exists and can be mitigated. If it is determined that OCI issue exists that cannot be mitigated, or if the OCI plan is not reasonable or complete, the offeror may not be eligible for award.

**C. Business System Adequacy**

In accordance with FAR 16.301-3, Cost-Reimbursement Contracts – Limitations, the offeror's accounting system status will be reviewed to determine if the offeror has an adequate accounting system. A contract may only be awarded to an offeror with an accounting system determined to be adequate by the Government.

**D. Government Property Management Plan**

The Government will evaluate the Government Property Management Plan for acceptability.

**E. Responsibility Information**

As appropriate, any additional information submitted to demonstrate status as a responsible offeror will be used in determining responsibility in accordance with FAR 9.104.

(End of Provision)

[END OF SECTION]